

U.S. airlines are flying to Cuba, does anyone here honestly think that preventing Americans from traveling there is an appropriate role of the Federal government? Why only Cuba? Why not Venezuela? Or Russia? Or Iran, or anywhere else? It is a vindictive, discriminatory, self-defeating vestige of a time long passed.

This bill would end these Cold War restrictions on the freedom of Americans to travel. It would not do away with the embargo.

Americans overwhelmingly favor travel to Cuba. The last poll I saw, a CBS poll, found that 81 percent of Americans support expanding travel to Cuba. Officials in the White House, however, have a different agenda, driven by purely domestic political calculations. They have not only rolled back steps taken by the previous administration to encourage engagement with Cuba, they have gone further by imposing even more onerous restrictions on the right of Americans to travel. As a result, the number of Americans traveling to Cuba this year is projected to plummet by half, due to the policies of their own government. And the thousands of private Cuban entrepreneurs, the taxi drivers, the Airbnb renters, restaurants, and shops that depend on American customers are struggling to survive. It is a shortsighted, anachronistic policy that is beneath our democracy.

I and others, including Republicans, have traveled to Cuba many times over the past 20 years, met with Cuban officials, with Cubans who have been persecuted for opposing the government, and with many others. Every one of us wants to see an end to political repression in Cuba. The arrests and mistreatment of dissidents by the Cuban government should be condemned, just as we should condemn such abuses by other governments including some, like Egypt and Turkey, whose leaders have been welcomed at the White House and the State Department. Americans can travel freely to Egypt, Turkey, and Saudi Arabia, but not to Cuba.

The issue is how best to support the people of Cuba who struggle to make ends meet, and who want to live in a country where freedom of expression and association are protected. Anyone who thinks that more economic pressure, or ultimatums, will force the Cuban authorities to stop arresting political dissidents and embrace democracy have learned nothing from history. For more than half a century we tried a policy of unilateral sanctions and isolation, and it achieved neither of those goals. Instead, it is the Cuban people who were hurt the most. And it provided an opening in this hemisphere for Russia, China, and our other competitors.

Change is coming to Cuba, and we can help support that process. Or we can sit on the sidelines and falsely claim to be helping the Cuban people, while pursuing a failed policy of puni-

tive sanctions. The bipartisan bill I am introducing is about the right of Americans, not Cubans, to travel. Every member of Congress, especially those who have been to Cuba, should oppose restrictions on American citizens that have no place in the law books of a free society.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 287—ESTABLISHING APPROPRIATE THRESHOLDS FOR CERTAIN BUDGET POINTS OF ORDER IN THE SENATE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BRAUN (for himself and Ms. ERNST) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Budget:

S. RES. 287

Resolved,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Make Rules Matter Act".

SEC. 2. THRESHOLDS FOR BUDGET POINTS OF ORDER.

(a) THRESHOLD FOR POINT OF ORDER AGAINST EMERGENCY DESIGNATIONS.—

(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term "emergency designation point of order" means a point of order raised under—

(A) section 314(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 645(e));

(B) section 4(g)(3) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 933(g)(3)); or

(C) section 4112(e) of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

(2) WAIVER.—In the Senate, an emergency designation point of order may be waived or suspended only by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(3) APPEAL.—In the Senate, an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on an emergency designation point of order.

(b) THRESHOLD FOR LARGE BUDGET IMPACT FOR CERTAIN CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974 POINTS OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A point of order described in paragraph (3) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—In the Senate, an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order described in paragraph (3).

(3) DESCRIPTION OF LARGE BUDGET IMPACT.—A point of order described in this paragraph is a point of order under section 302(f)(2) or 311(a)(2)(A) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(f)(2), 642(a)(2)(A)) against legislation that would, within the time periods applicable to the point of order, as determined by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate, cause budget authority or outlays to exceed the applicable allocation, suballocation, level, or aggregate by more than \$5,000,000,000.

(c) DE MINIMIS BUDGET IMPACT.—For a violation for which the absolute value of the violation is not more than \$500,000, a point of order shall not lie—

(1) under the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) (except for a point of order under section 302 or 311 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 633, 642)); or

(2) under any concurrent resolution on the budget.

(d) THRESHOLD FOR INCREASING SHORT-TERM DEFICITS.—

(1) REDUCTION IN NET INCREASE IN THE DEFICIT.—In the Senate, section 404(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, shall be applied by substituting "\$1,000,000,000" for "\$10,000,000,000".

(2) WAIVER AND APPEAL FOR LARGE BUDGET IMPACT IN THE SENATE.—

(A) WAIVER.—In the Senate, section 404(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, may be waived or suspended by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, if the net increase in the deficit in any fiscal year exceeds \$10,000,000,000.

(B) APPEAL.—In the Senate, an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under section 404(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, if the net increase in the deficit in any fiscal year exceeds \$10,000,000,000.

(e) THRESHOLD FOR INCREASING LONG-TERM DEFICITS.—

(1) REDUCTION IN NET INCREASE IN THE DEFICIT.—In the Senate, subsections (a) and (b)(1) of section 3101 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, shall each be applied by substituting "\$1,000,000,000" for "\$5,000,000,000".

(2) WAIVER AND APPEAL FOR LARGE BUDGET IMPACT IN THE SENATE.—

(A) WAIVER.—In the Senate, section 3101(b)(1) of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, may be waived or suspended by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, if the net increase in on-budget deficits in any 10-fiscal-year period exceeds \$10,000,000,000.

(B) APPEAL.—In the Senate, an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under section 3101(b)(1) of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, if the net increase in on-budget deficits in any 10-fiscal-year period exceeds \$10,000,000,000.

SENATE RESOLUTION 288—AFFIRMING THE IMPORTANCE OF THE LONG-TERM SOLVENCY OF THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

Mr. BRAUN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works:

S. RES. 288

Whereas, in July 2019, the public debt of the United States was more than \$22,000,000,000,000, increasing each year by a Federal budget deficit of nearly \$1,000,000,000,000;

Whereas the Federal Government is facing shortfalls in several Federal trust funds, including the Highway Trust Fund, which is expected to reach insolvency in July 2021;

Whereas the infrastructure of the United States needs substantial investment in order to continue supporting the growing economy of the United States;

Whereas, according to a report published in 2015 by the Federal Highway Administration, 20 percent of the Federal-aid highways in the United States were in poor condition;